Vol. X, No. 10 HUMAN EVENTS March 11, 1953

MINNESOTA MAR 26 53

BEWARE OF DEFENSE

By FRANK CHODOROV

IT HAD TO HAPPEN. The popular appeal of the word defense could not forever escape the attention of the socialists. It is too pregnant with possibilities to escape capture, perversion and incarceration in their arsenal of semantics. Like democracy or freedom or liberalism, defense is a word that needs watching.

When we speak of socialists we must be careful not to limit ourselves to the simon-pures who still cling to the gospel as given by Karl Marx; these are too few and too inconsequential to warrant attention. We must include among the effective socialists the high-minded preacher who would substitute the majesty of the law for the dignity of man. We must include the erudite peddler of a plan that needs only the implementation of the law to prove its perfection. We must include the entrepreneur who, quite unconscious of what socialism is, helps it along because he sees an immediate profit in it. We must include the run-of-the-mill bureaucrat because he is of the essence of socialism. We must include the Honorable Senator (Democrat or Republican) who, when a reduction of taxes is suggested, explodes: "No, no — defense." All are socialists because all are working toward the same end: a regime of Statism.

The deliberate perversion of defense is probably the work of the doctrinaires — the others are merely unconscious accessories — whose well-known agility at performing mental and moral flip-flops is the wonder of our times. It should be remembered that militarism, particularly that related to national security, has always been anathema to their creed; it was always stigmatized as the hallmark of hated capitalism. Hence, these socialists were pacifists, not on moral or economic grounds, but out of conviction based on "scientific" socialism.

THUS RUNNETH THE "scientific" syllogism: Under the profit-system, said Karl Marx, the owners of capital are periodically burdened with a surfeit of goods; this must be so because the meager wages they pay their "wage slaves" makes it impossible for the latter to absorb all they produce. To get rid of this glut, the capitalists look to foreign markets, where they run into competition with similarly situated capitalists from other countries, and out of this competition for markets comes war. The only way to abolish

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war, then, is to abolish capitalism. How, under the circumstances, could any true believer give aid or comfort to militarism?

This doctrine had the force of revealed truth to all socialists — until the U.S.S.R. was born. Then the anomaly of the model socialist country going militaristic in a big way occasioned some vigorous head-scratching, out of which came a major modification of the infallible truth. In this case, they explained, militarism was forced on the proletarian dictatorship by "capitalistic encirclement"; only dire necessity could compel the socialist fatherland to adopt a policy that was wholly inconsistent with its nature. However, when all the nations of the world shall have embraced socialism, militarism will automatically disappear from the earth. In the meantime, since pacifism and socialism are synonymous, it behooves all good socialists to oppose capitalistic militarism at every turn.

During the second World War the pacifistic note in doctrinaire socialism had to be soft-pedalled again; the danger to the fatherland made it proper to put Karl Marx aside. But, out of the exigencies of war came the remarkable discovery that despite its capitalistic character militarism could be put to the advancement of socialism. The cult had always maintained that capitalism was doomed to commit suicide, but now they learned that the blessed event could be hastened by the prodigious expenditures that militarism entailed. Why not help it along? Yes, the more defense the better. And so, the intellectual flip-flop was completed.

DURING THE PAST FIVE years the socialistic exploitation of defense was facilitated by the increasing tension in the relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Korea made their task still easier. Fear and patriotism combined to overcome any cavilling at waste and high taxes. Defense became the open sesame for spending.

A few examples are in order. Last year, when the State Department was laboring over its budgetary problem, the word went out to the heads of departments to lump their various projects under "national security", if at all possible. Congress could hardly oppose anything so labelled.

Then there is the quaint idea that allies can be bought, like mercenaries, an idea that came to the rescue of all foreign aid programs after sympathy for the war-impoverished peoples had worn thin. Plausibility was given the idea by the argument that an economically depressed people would not fight, even for their national security; in the interests of defense, therefore, we must build up the economy of our much-needed allies regardless of cost. We cannot afford to let them go Communistic.

One of the latest wrinkles in defense spending is the thing called off-shore procurement. Since we have to buy things for our soldiers in Europe, why not buy them from Euro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peans, thus winning their good will as well as building up their morale? Quite plausible. So, we send the Italians a cotton mill, supply it with raw material, and then buy from them, for cash, the output of the mill. A common sense economist might call it lunacy; but it is not — it is defense.

This dumping of our dollars into foreign cesspools is favored because of the amounts involved. But the domestic drain is not neglected. The inside wastage comes only to millions, not billions, and they are of only routine nature, like providing the thousands of Pentagon girls with the latest form-fitting chairs at $47.50 each; or the millions spent on entertaining radio programs that are sponsored by the army, navy or marines, for the ostensible purpose of stimulating recruitment. In the aggregate, these trivial bills, if enough of them are incurred (and they are), help to accelerate spending ourselves into socialism, which is the prime purpose.

THE DIFFICULTY of defining defense plays into the hands of our socialistic brethren. The military, who ought to know, are as confused on this score as are the laymen, including members of Congress. Putting aside the natural inclination of these uniformed bureaucrats to build themselves into greater importance and better jobs, the fact is that there is violent and perhaps honest disagreement between them as to how best to defend the nation; the navy wants ships for its admirals, the army argues that foot soldiers for generals are far more important, while the air force insists that the next war will be won or lost in the air. Meanwhile, experts in mufti — like economics and psychology professors — have their own theories of warfare.

In this fog of confused counsel, what is the Congressman, the guardian of the taxpayers' money, to do? The only thing he can do under the circumstances is to vote billions to each claimant vociferous enough to make himself heard, taking care at the same time to establish his own reputation for integrity by slicing a few cents off the budgetary requests of each one. This practice of make-believe parsimony is so well-known, however, that the claimants for appropriations always discount it in making up their estimates, and it is said that sometimes Congress does not cut as much as had been expected, giving the bureaus more money than even their profligacy had anticipated.

The probability is — judging by the history of past wars — that most of the defense programs now costing us billions (and threatening to cost us our freedom) will prove of little or no value when the war for which they are designed actually begins. In the nature of things, preparations for war are influenced by the lessons of past wars. Yet, every conflict in the history of the world has brought about conditions that could not be anticipated, making a mockery of the preparations. It is not only that the best experts can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not know the full strength of the enemy, nor exactly what he has in the way of weapons, but that the war itself provides the laboratory from which we learn what we should have been prepared for.

As against this historic fact there is another, that unprotected nations have been periodically overrun by marauders. Hence, it would hardly do to leave ourselves unarmed. To suggest such a course would be, at any rate, as silly as to suggest to a lady that she would be just as attractive if she refrained from using lipstick; it simply is not being done. Preparedness is the going order, and argument is useless.

The conscientious Congressman cannot avoid voting appropriations for something, anything, and must rely on his own judgment as to both its possible utility and how much of it the economy can safely absorb. The best he can do is to formulate a layman's rule-of-thumb to go by. As a beginning, he might fortify himself against major mistakes by determining to reject, sight unseen, any program labelled "national security"; that bottle, experience has shown, contains nothing but expensive snake oil. Thus fortified, he could not go far wrong if he limited his Congressional consent to such things as would put some utensil for killing or self defense at the disposal of the fighting man: physical things, like arms, armor or armament. Whether or not these things will prove their worth in battle he cannot know, but his conscience would be clear; he tried. But, that rule-of-thumb would automatically rule out all this expensive and unproven psychological stuff, and economic panaceas, and form-fitting chairs, and especially those job-spawning international ventures.

The certain result of such common sense delimitation of preparedness would be to save the taxpayer a lot of money. The saving would not only be some safeguard of private property, but would also go a long way toward building up our war potential. For, it is a certainty that much of this money would be spent on the usual American gadgetry, automobiles and washing machines, which are made in factories that will stand us in good stead if and when war comes.

Who could possibly be opposed to this diversion of money from waste to production? Only the socialists; the doctrinaires out of design, the unconscious ones out of a diversity of motives. The main objection to such parsimony, of course, is that it would prevent the collapse of capitalism and the consequent coming of socialism. Therefore, the more "defense" the better. Did not Karl Marx himself say that the way to kill capitalism is to tax it to death?

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume X, No. 10 Wednesday, March 11, 1953 Washington, D. C.

MAR 26 '53

The Riddle of The Kremlin: Efforts to unlock the secret of just what kind of man has succeeded Stalin have so far failed to mention one clue which is fraught with great significance. Some observers here find in it the explanation of recent important developments and a foretaste of things to come.

The clue is this: According to experts on Russia and Asia, Malenkov comes of Moslem parentage and was raised a Moslem.

The evidence is impressive. In the currently popular book *My Uncle Joseph Stalin* by Budu Svanidze (Putnam, New York, $3.00), the nephew of the now deceased dictator describes Malenkov from personal remembrance as "Malenkov, with his *bashkir face* . . . the *bashkirs* were a people of the Urals of Turkish-Alteien origin, a group to which Malenkov's father belonged." Our contributor, William Henry Chamberlin, an authority on the Soviet Union with a great knowledge of its geography, describes the *bashkirs* as a Mohammedan tribe (in the *Freeman*, March 9). Malenkov was born, according to official biographical information, in Orenburg, in the lower Urals. This is in the center of the *bashkir* region.

Finally, a German geopolitical scientist, possessing an excellent familiarity with the background of Soviet leaders, informs us that Malenkov was born a Moslem and raised in the faith until the age of fourteen.

The significance of this information becomes clear in view of Moscow's recent efforts to court the Moslems and to exploit Arab antipathy toward Zionism. We learn also from intelligence sources that the Grand Mufti, bitter foe of Zionism and connected with the terrorist Moslem Brotherhood, secretly visited Moscow and conferred with the Politburo in 1948, 1949 and 1951. Malenkov has long been a key figure in the Politburo.

News reports have emphasized for sometime that Malenkov is "anti-semitic". A more precise terminology would seem to be "anti-Jewish" and "anti-Zionist". With this pattern in mind, one may understand better the developing anti-Jewish, pro-Moslem and pro-Arab diplomacy of the Soviet Union in the past few years, culminating in the liquidation of the Jewish doctors and the trial of the Jewish Communist leader, Rudolph Slansky, in Prague. It seems certain now that for some time Malenkov, as Stalin's predestined successor, has been exerting a strong influence on Soviet foreign policy.

It may well be — as shrewd observers during the past week have been proclaiming — that a "pause" in the hitherto aggressive foreign policy of the Kremlin could take place now, until consolidation of the new regime is achieved. But this fresh light on the pudgy features of the "new Czar" suggests trouble ahead in a highly strategic sector of the cold war — one in which we are badly prepared.

Our "Tammany politics" support of Zionist ambitions (about which HUMAN EVENTS issued a warning as long ago as 1946) now appears as a dubious investment, with the growing hostility towards us of a Moslem world totalling some 300,000,000 people. In view of the fact that the geographical center of this group is also the "soft underbelly" of the Soviet homeland, and the best approach for a knock-out air attack — the shadow of "Malenkov the Moslem" looms dark indeed.

Anglo-American Trade Talks: A highly placed U.S. official with whom we conversed, describes conversations with Eden and Butler in Washington as mainly "talk" and assigns little value to British promises to tighten exports to China. The "trade not aid" subject is filled with "buncombe". American

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic experts scoff at the "bugaboo" of American tariffs so widely publicized by foreigners. The experts point out that over 90 per cent of our imports are either free of tariffs or pay low duties.

According to Mr. John Crane, American foreign correspondent, writing from London, the recent OEEC reports stated that Europe could not get rid of its "dollar gap" even if the U.S. dropped all tariffs; and that only about 20 per cent of the "dollar gap" would disappear. Europe, it is pointed out, has not only tariffs, but also embargoes, import licensing and exchange controls to block the free flow of international trade.

Ike and Hoover: One of the strange phenomena of the new regime: there has appeared no discernible evidence that the Eisenhower administration has had any contact whatsoever with the only living GOP ex-President. In Washington, it is recalled that within six weeks after Truman took office in 1945, the Democratic President called in Mr. Hoover and asked his advice not only on economic but also on foreign policy matters. From then on for several years, Truman consulted Mr. Hoover frequently and utilized his services in handling the world food problem, acute at that time. Then the Democratic President chose the great engineer to design the reorganization-of-government plan.

The odd indifference shown by the White House towards Hoover today is all the more striking in that last fall Hoover — on the request of Eisenhower — publicly declared his support of the GOP candidate in a memorable nationwide broadcast. (It is rumored that, although the Ike Campaign Headquarters had ample money for television, Mr. Hoover's friends and admirers raised the $50,000 to underwrite the costs of this address.)

Now, this inexplicable situation is causing some concern among GOP leaders on Capitol Hill — for a specific reason. The reorganization-of-government bill will occupy an important place on the legislative agenda during coming months. Senate and House committees will hold hearings. The climax of such hearings will obviously be the day when Mr. Hoover will appear on the stand. What will he say?

His discourse could be very critical. It is regarded as very likely that, unless the new legislation conforms with his ideas, Mr. Hoover will bluntly state his criticisms — with political implications the Democrats might exploit. Yet the Administrative committee handling the legislation (composed of Nelson Rockefeller, Arthur Flemming and Milton Eisenhower) has not so far consulted the ex-President. Members of Congress are quite disturbed about this. They fear that again (as in the case of Secretary of Defense Wilson's stockholdings) a situation will arise that easily could have been avoided by a little consultation and preparation in advance.

Problem of Bureaucracy: Senator Robert A. Taft voiced the attitude of many of his colleagues on March 7 when he said: "It seems obvious to me that a man running a Government activity must have his own people in high office; every member of the cabinet has that problem and so have division heads. The President's contemplated order doesn't even raise the question of Civil Service. But I'm not even promising to maintain the Civil Service system intact." (Taft was referring to Ike's proposal to eliminate several hundred persons blanketed under the Civil Service system who were thereby protected against dismissal, by order of Truman.)

Wherever Republicans gather in the Capital, talk these days constantly turns to what is recognized as the crucial problem facing the new regime — upon which it will stand or fall. Unless Democratic holdovers and collectivist-minded bureaucrats are purged in considerable numbers, the new philosophy of freedom brought in by the Eisenhower regime will be sabotaged. The impetus behind a real purge of these elements is in no sense a desire for a large number of patronage jobs to distribute to the GOP faithful. The aim is to free the Executive Arm from saboteurs so that it can, without impediment, carry out the mandate given by the people last November.

Indeed, the whole concept of Civil Service — as it was initiated and set up a half century ago — is under attack on basic grounds. It is pointed out that the new world conflict of ideas has rendered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the concept obsolete. For the bureaucracy has been largely recruited in recent years from the ranks of the "intelligentsia", and the latter class has been in considerable part corrupted by Communist, statist and collectivist ideas. Such a corps of bureaucrats could hardly do other than subvert the traditionally American policies introduced by the cabinet members of the new regime. Hence the troubles of Messrs. Dulles and Lourie in the State Department, Mr. Dodge in his efforts to cut the budget, Mrs. Hobby literally surrounded by these elements in her Federal Security Agency. And hence the bucking and jerking of the new Republican regime.

Press: Columnist Westbrook Pegler has vigorously attacked Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Meyer, publishers of the *Washington Post*, which paper Pegler calls "mock Republican". The famous columnist accords Mrs. Meyer much the same kind of treatment that he periodically gives Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt — with much the same kind of epithets. Pegler discusses the error of Congressman Harold Velde in confusing Mrs. Meyer with another lady with a similar name who did have a vulnerable record. Pegler points out that the *Washington Post* in the past has scarcely leaned over backward in respecting the reputation of persons, particularly in its regular publication of Drew Pearson's column. The Pegler piece appeared in the New York *Journal American* on March 8, but did not appear in the Washington *Times-Herald*, which usually runs the Pegler column.

● The Jenner subcommittee investigating subversives in the teaching profession has filed a protest with the Associated Press about that wire service's coverage of a hearing last week. At the hearing, Miss Tima D. Ludins, a former New York schoolteacher, refused to answer questions on the ground of constitutional rights — and made a good deal of noise doing so. Many observers believe that the A.P. coverage was slanted in favor of Miss Ludins.

Education Front: Mrs. Lucille Cardin Crain, leader in the fight to overthrow the Brahmin caste of left-wing educators, has called notice to a new twist in the propaganda of that group. She notes the "refrain" of "citizenship" in the recent releases of these educators. "One of the storm signals", warns Mrs. Crain, "in the new semantic onslaught was the change, last year, by Presidential edict, from the time-honored Constitution Day on September 17 to Citizenship Day. Is this an intermediate stage to World Citizenship?"

Mrs. Crain (her remarks are embodied in a speech given February 13 to the Michigan Women's National Security Council in Detroit) emphasized that this new use of "citizenship" is apparently designed to substitute "citizenship" for the Constitution as though the latter word deserves no consideration and there is no relation between the two terms. She quoted the Report of the New York Bar Association Committee which said: "By itself the word 'citizenship' can lead anywhere that an uninformed or subversive teacher desires. Russia has citizenship. Hitler's Germany had it. All nations have it. The Constitutional character of our citizenship is the heart of the matter and the only legitimate subject of instruction in our vast educational public system as the law of New York makes crystal clear."

Mrs. Crain goes on to explain, such schemes are devised in the schools of education in public and private universities. They are then fanned out through the public school directorate and through a network of professional and lay educational organizations, the aggregate power of which is staggering. And the professors, as Mrs. Crain says, have arrogated to themselves the sole responsibility to speak in the matter of public school policy, and have abused parents and independent educators who venture to protest.

In her conclusion, Mrs. Crain says that the educational controversy "is in a very real sense women's business". While businessmen are aware of it, they do not have the time to devote to countermeasures. "We women have a reputation for getting things done", says Mrs. Crain. "It is our heritage as Americans which is today at stake in our classrooms."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Return of Germany, by Norbert Muhlen. Chicago. Henry Regnery Company. $4.50. Reviewed by William Henry Chamberlin.

This firsthand, authoritative account of modern Germany, written with unfailing insight and frequent brilliance, is calculated to fill a serious gap in the knowledge of the average American. There has not been much good writing about Germany since the war. Journalistic coverage has been below par. Gustav Stolper's *German Realities* and Freda Utley's more impassioned *The High Cost of Vengeance* performed a useful service in calling attention to the cruelty, folly and self-contradiction of the vindictive economic policies which were followed in the first years of the occupation.

Fortunately, these policies have been almost entirely discarded and the German economic recovery of the last four years has been an amazing feat and a resounding demonstration of the inherent dynamism of free enterprise capitalism. Mr. Muhlen, a Catholic political refugee before the war with a long anti-Nazi record, gives a picture of Germany that is up-to-date, that shows how Germans are reacting to the issues of today and tomorrow.

To speak of Germany in the singular is misleading. There are two Germanies, the larger and much more populous German Federal Republic, with its capital at Bonn, and the "German Democratic Republic", a Soviet puppet state set up in the eastern zone of Russian occupation. The author paints the contrast between these two Germanies in vivid colors and shows why thousands of East Germans have been fleeing every day for weeks into West Berlin, abandoning their homes and property and seeking asylum in the West. Much of the considerable time he has spent in Germany since the war has been spent in Berlin, where very detailed information about East German conditions is available.

By the end of 1951 close to 160,000 "enemies of the people" and 185,000 "war criminals" had been arrested and imprisoned or killed in East Germany. This far exceeded Hitler's terror before the war. East Germany has been pillaged and exploited in every conceivable way by the Soviet Occupation authorities. Dismantling of industrial equipment has been far in excess of anything known in the western zones. Soviet exactions in reparations and occupation costs amounted to 11.3 billion dollars between 1945 and 1950; and, needless to say, there was no Soviet equivalent for the Marshall Plan and other aid which was sent to West Germany and must be weighed in the balance against the German payments of western occupation costs.

If the picture of East Germany is completely black, with milk and fat consumption about half of the West German figure and the general level of real wages down about forty or fifty per cent from 1936, the situation in West Germany is grey, rather than white. There are tremendous outlays for refugees, war widows and the disabled; and against the visible street window prosperity must be reckoned the unseen quiet suffering of many who live on a subsistence basis.

However, the movement of refugees is the best proof of relatively superior well-being in the West. Mr. Muhlen gives an admirably balanced survey of American occupation policy — neither a whitewash nor a one-sided querulous complaint. Some shameful things were done in the first years of occupation; American soldiers still get drunk and disorderly more often than is desirable; and a foolish missionary spirit among some of the would be American "re-educators" did more harm than good. On the other hand the author recognizes the benefit of the trips to America arranged for many Germans and of the good influence of many individual Americans. Leaving no doubt that America, in the eyes of most Germans, is a lesser evil than the Soviet Union, the author warns at the end that a free Germany cannot be bound to the West "without binding the West and ourselves to a free Germany".

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED